

and if it were, would work against the so-called discoverer in favor of the natives of the newly-found coasts. In fine, the destination of the sea is clearly for the common benefit of mankind; it is a common pathway, separating, yet binding, intended alike for all. The liberty of the sea and of navigation is now admitted on all hands. * * * The English, in the seventeenth century, claimed property in the seas surrounding Great Britain, as far as to the coasts of the neighboring countries, and the eighteenth century only softened down the claim of property into one of sovereignty. * * * Russia, finally, at a more recent date, based an exclusive claim to the Pacific, north of the fifty-first degree, upon the ground that this part of the ocean was a passage to shores lying exclusively within her jurisdiction. But this claim was resisted by our Government in the temporary convention of 1824. A treaty of the same empire with Great Britain in 1825 contained similar concessions.

THE BENEFITS OF PROTECTION.

In another page will be found an editorial which appeared in the *Toronto Globe* a few days ago. It is in reply to an article which appeared in the last issue of this journal; the question under discussion being whether the farmer is benefited by Protection. Our object in reproducing the *Globe's* editorial is that the matter may be fully and fairly understood.

Alluding to the painful depression in agricultural industries in England, we argued that unless some sort of relief were afforded to the British farmer, British agriculture must perish. As an answer to this the *Globe* says it is a pity we did not "stop to enquire what the probable consequences of dearer bread would be to other British industries." It shows that under the old Corn Laws the price of wheat frequently reached a famine height—that in 1801 it was 155 shillings per quarter of eight bushels, and that from that year until 1818 it averaged 84 shillings. This meant hunger, it says, and frequently death by starvation to many, and yet the farmer was not prosperous. It shows that food to the value of probably \$2,000,000,000 is annually consumed in the United Kingdom; and that if a moderate protection of only ten per cent. were imposed upon all food products, the \$200,000,000 raised by taxation upon the consumers would be felt by the poor more than by the rich—that the prevention of the present distress by Protection would be infinitely worse than the disease of Free Trade in its effects upon British interests generally.

We do not think it a waste of energy to discuss Protection to British agricultural interests, and to all British industrial interests as a practical policy.

In the language of the immortal Rev. Jasper: "The sun do move;" and because such is the fact it does not follow that because under Protection in 1801 the price of wheat reached 155 shillings per quarter, there should not be starvation in the land and great distress in 1890, as is the case, under Free Trade with wheat at 28 shillings. The surrounding circumstances have entirely changed. The prevailing distress in England is a fact to which even the Cobden Club dare not close its eyes; for at the recent annual meeting of that club Mr. Medley, one of the secretaries, in endeavoring to explain it, declared that the situation was to be attributed to (1) the opening up of new fields of production in agriculture and mining; (2) the discovery of new and cheaper processes of manufacture; (3) economy of transportation by land and sea;

(4) the changes wrought by electricity in all matters of commerce, and (5) the fall in prices owing to currency changes. Mr. Medley thinks that so far as British trade goes these disturbing agencies have spent their force; and he points to the fact that the foreign trade of that country last year reached highwater mark:—that "the country is enjoying an abounding prosperity." But Mr. Medley certainly does not expect the world, or even the *Globe*, to accept this assertion when the contrary facts are well known. If England is "abounding in prosperity" why do we see thousands of acres of farming land going out of cultivation every year? Why do we see thousands of farmers and agricultural laborers flocking to the cities seeking employment which they cannot obtain on the farms? Why do we see thousands of dock laborers and coal miners striking against starvation wages? Why is it that even those in Government employ—policemen and postmen furious and desperate from their unequal battle for life, quitting their employment because they do not receive enough remuneration for their services to enable them to keep soul and body together? If the Cobden Club and Free Traders generally can perceive "abounding prosperity" in this situation, it is much more than the laboring classes of England can do.

The *Globe*, echoing the Cobden Club, contends that the foreign trade of a country is the measure of prosperity, pointing to the fact that last year England in this respect "reached highwater mark." Of what benefit is this immense foreign trade to the laboring classes of England? The brawn and muscle of these classes is the source of wealth, but how much of this wealth do they enjoy? The *Globe* thinks they would object to having the cost of their living increased ten per cent. by Protection, and quotes Lord Salisbury as saying that "Protection would introduce a state of division among the classes which would differ little from civil war." To the *Globe* we would say that if the starving and unemployed poor of England have no money the price of food is an unimportant matter. Under Free Trade starvation is the companion of the poor, and they would hail with joy the introduction of any fiscal system that would give them employment at living wages. Protection would do this. To Lord Salisbury we would say that if the introduction of Protection, giving employment at living wages to the now starving masses, would bring about civil war, as distressing as such an event would be, it would be less objectionable to them than lingering starvation. Lord Salisbury stands in no danger of death by starvation, neither do the gentlemen of the Cobden Club. Their livings are assured. But the laboring classes of England must have employment, and they will not allow the chimerical views of the Free Traders to stand between them and it. My Lord should ponder upon Abraham Lincoln's views of Government which, he said, should be "from the people, by the people, and for the people."

Did Free Trade cause the prosperity of England, or did it result in spite of it? Professor Fawcett says:

We in England are much too prone to over-state the results of Free Trade. Scarcely a week passes without its being said that English imports and exports have more than quadrupled since Protection was abolished, the income of the country as shown by the income-tax has more than doubled, wages have been advanced and population has increased. But a moment's consideration will show that other causes have been in opera-